

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20. Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 13 and 16-20 are amended herein. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 3-10, 12-18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,062,465 (Shafiee).

Shafiee does not teach or suggest "transmitting processing results to the first control unit and to a second control unit... that is in a group relationship with the first control unit", where the first control unit operates as "a master device in a master-slave communication established between the first control unit and the second control unit" and the first and second units are "switchably operable as the master device and a slave device responsive to a user request", as recited in claim 3.

Claim 7 also recites, "transmitting the processing results to the first apparatus and to a second apparatus different from the first apparatus and is in a group relationship with the first apparatus responsive to the request", where the first and second apparatuses are "switchably operable as the master and a slave responsive to a user request."

Similarly, claims 10, 13, 16, 17 and 18 recite transmitting "processing results to the first apparatus and to the second apparatus" where the first and second apparatuses (or devices) are "switchably operable as the master and a slave responsive to a user request."

Claim 20 recites, "receiving a request from a first device to remotely operate a second device, said first device and said second device being switchably operable as a master device and a slave device responsive to a user request", "identifying a group relationship of the first device and the second device" and "transmitting the web page content to both the first device and the second device in response to said request from the first device."

Shafiee does not teach or suggest the above identified features of claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 20. Instead, Shafiee is directed to agent controlled synchronized browsing where a live agent controls a kiosk terminal to display information to the customer via a web browser and/or a display device (see, col. 4, line 25-30). In Shafiee, customers at kiosks wish to communicate with an agent (by touching a service button for example), the respective kiosks

then send requests to the multimedia session manager which provides a call management process for setting up, modifying, or terminating calls between a live agent at an agent station and the customers at the kiosks (see, col. 5, lines 48-66 and col. 10, lines 35-42). As such, Shafiee is limited to individually assisting customers at each kiosk by displaying requested information to each of the kiosks, regardless of content of the requested information.

Shafiee does not teach or suggest each and every claimed feature including transmitting "processing results to the first apparatus and to the second apparatus" where first and second apparatuses (or devices) "switchably operable as a master and a slave responsive to a user request", as taught by the claimed invention (see above discussion of independent claims).

As dependent claims 4-6, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 15 depend from respective independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented above for the independent claims.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafiee and U.S. Patent No. 6,584,493 (Butler).

The Examiner relies on Butler as teaching disabling user operation of the second device. Butler discusses passing control of a shared conference application to a participant and periodically broadcasting updates from a host to all participants, where inputs from the participants are only sent privately from a controller to the host (see, col. 3, lines 10-28 and col. 11, lines 1-12).

As mentioned above, Shafiee is limited to providing individual assistance to customers at each kiosk.

Shafiee and/or Butler do not teach or suggest "disabling user operation of the second device and establishing a remote operation relationship between the first device as a master device and the second device as a slave device [where] the first and second devices are "switchably operable as the master device and the slave device responsive to a user request", as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites, "sending the Web page to the first device and to the second device that is in a group relationship with the first device" and displaying the page "on a display of the first device and the second device." Claim 2 recites similar features.

Claim 19 recites, “transmitting a request of the first device to a second device having the group affiliation of the first device” and “establishing a remote operation between the second device operating as a master client and the first device operating as a slave client by disabling a user operation” where said first and devices are “switchably operable as the master client and the slave client responsive to a user request.”

Shafiee and Butler, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed features discussed above including selectively establishing a master-client communication between devices where device are “switchably operable as the master client and the slave client responsive to a user request”, as recited in the independent claims.

For at least the same reasons discussed above, claims depending from claims 1 and 2 are also patentably distinguishable over Shafiee and Butler.

On page 12 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that remote controlling is well known method in the art where the controlling unit functions as the master in controlling the slaves operations. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s statement because supporting evidence related to the claimed remote operation has not been provided, and respectfully request that the Examiner produce authority for the statement.

The Applicants specifically point out the following errors in the Examiner’s action.

First, the Examiner uses common knowledge (“well-known”) evidence for the rejection. As explained in the M.P.E.P.,

any facts so noticed should... server only to “fill in the gaps” in an insubstantial manner which might exist in the evidentiary showing made by the Examiner to support a particular ground for rejection. It is never appropriate to rely solely on common knowledge in the art without evidentiary support in the record as the principal evidence upon which a rejection is based.

M.P.E.P. § 2144.03

Second, the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. In this case, the limitation is not of notorious character or capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. Instead, this limitation is unique to the present invention (see, M.P.E.P. § 2144.03(A) (the notice of facts beyond the record which may be taken by the Examiner must be “capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute”).

Third, there is no evidence supporting the Examiner's assertion (see, M.P.E.P. § 2144.03(B) ("there must be some form of evidence in the record to support an assertion of common knowledge").

Fourth, the Examiner appears to be basing the rejections, at least in part, on personal knowledge. The Examiner is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2) to support such assertion with an affidavit when called for by the Applicant. The Examiner is called upon to support such assertion.

Further, even if the Examiner's assertion and rejection based on common knowledge is valid, the claimed invention is distinguishable as discussed above.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to the claims because the amendments were made to clarify the claimed features and do not introduce significant changes that would require a further search.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10/09/2007

By: *Temnit Afework*
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501